

REMARKS

Claims 11-14 are allowed. Claim 1 is amended. Claim 10 is cancelled. Claims 15-22 are added. No new subject matter is present in the claims. Claims 1-9 and 11-22 remain in the case for consideration, and allowance of claims 1-9 and 11-22 is requested in light of the following remarks.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 11-14 are allowed.

Claims 2-9 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but are otherwise indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form and including all the features of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In keeping with this suggestion, new claims 15-18 are added. New claim 15 is written in independent form, and contains all the features of original claim 1 and claim 2. New claim 16 depends from claim 15, and contains all the features of original claim 3. New claim 17 depends from claim 16, and contains all the features of original claim 4. New claim 18 depends from claim 16, and contains all the features of original claim 5. Thus, new claims 15-18 should be allowable.

Amendments

Claim 1 is amended to recite that the voltage level detector is configured to sense a voltage and is configured to generate a power-up signal while the voltage is less than a minimum voltage required to operate the device. This amendment is fully supported by the original application at, e.g., page 3, lines 31-33.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,768,207 to Raad, et al. ("Raad"). The applicant disagrees.

It is alleged that Raad discloses a ready/busy driver controller (FIG. 4, 58) configured to generate a busy enable signal (FIG. 4, 26) in response to the power up signal. It is also alleged that Raad discloses a ready/busy driver (Figure 4, 44) that is responsive to the busy enable signal (FIG. 4, 26).

To the contrary, Raad FIG. 3 and FIG. 4 clearly show that the alleged ready/busy driver (FIG. 4, 44) is not responsive to the alleged busy enable signal (FIGs. 3 and 4, 26). Rather, the alleged ready/busy driver 44 is actually the output node of the NAND gate 43

(column 4, lines 46-47). The alleged ready/busy signal 26 is an output of the logic circuit 32 (FIGs. 3 and 4), so the alleged ready/busy driver 44 (which forms part of the logic circuit 32) cannot be responsive to the alleged busy enable signal 26.

Consequently, Raad fails to anticipate claim 1 because it does not show the identical invention in as complete detail as contained in the claim. MPEP 2131.

Claim 10 is cancelled.

Claims 1 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,097,659 to Kang ("Kang"). The applicant disagrees.

Kang's FIG. 3 is a circuit detailing the power-up signal generator of FIG. 2 (column 2, lines 63-64). The power-up signal generator 300 of FIG. 2 produces a "low" level power-up signal SETB (FIG. 2; column 3, lines 39-40). Kang teaches that the power-up signal generator 300 is responsive to the external supply voltage level detector 100 and the internal supply voltage level detector 200 (FIG. 2). Kang teaches that the circuit 320 of FIG. 3 is actually a latch (column 3, line 47).

Thus, it is apparent that Kang's latch circuit 320 cannot be the recited voltage level detector. It neither senses a voltage nor does it generate a power-up signal while the voltage is less than a minimum voltage required to operate the device.

Consequently, Kang fails to anticipate claim 1 because it does not show the identical invention in as complete detail as contained in the claim. MPEP 2131.

Claim 10 is cancelled.

New Claims 19-22

New claim 19 is a method claim based upon claim 1 and elements of claim 2 that has been indicated to contain allowable subject matter. Consequently, it is believed that claim 19 is allowable over the prior art of record.

New claim 20 depends from claim 19 and is based upon elements of claim 3 that have been indicated to contain allowable subject matter. Consequently, it is believed that claim 20 is allowable over the prior art of record.

New claim 21 depends from claim 19 and is based upon elements of claim 3 that have been indicated to contain allowable subject matter. Consequently, it is believed that claim 21 is allowable over the prior art of record.


New claim 22 depends from claim 19 and is based upon page 4, lines 4-6 of the original application. It is believed that claim 22 is allowable over the prior art of record at least because of its dependence upon claim 19.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-9 and 10-22 is requested. Please telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.


Todd J. Iverson
Reg. No. 53,057

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.
1030 SW Morrison Street
Portland, OR 97205
503-222-3613
Customer No. 20575

